1

(A) 21 days after serving it, or

2

(B) if the pleading is one to which a responsive pleading is required, 21 days after service of a resoponsive pleading or 21 days after service

4

of a motion under Rule 12(b), (e), or (f), whichever is earlier.

5

motion to dismiss, Ms. Christensen made a single argument. She explained that because she

On January 30, 2012, ReconTrust moved to dismiss the complaint. In her opposition to the

67

intended to file an amended complaint pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(1)(B), the amended

8

complaint would render the motion to dismiss moot. On February 23, 2012, Ms. Christensen filed

9

her amended complaint. This court must determine if the amendment was proper and whether it

10

moots the instant motion to dismiss.

12

11

amend its pleading *once* as a matter of course. . ." Here, Ms. Christensen already exercised that

As the prefatory language found at Rule 15(a)(1) makes abundantly clear, "a party may

13

option when she amended her pleading pursuant to Rule 15(a)(1)(A) on January 9, 2012. Any

14

subsequent amendments to the pleadings Ms. Christensen wished to have made must have been with

15

the written consent of the opposing party or with leave of court. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2); see

16

also, Sackett & Kvan, Inc. v. Beaman, 399 F.2d 884, 889 (9th Cir. 1968) ("Since [plaintiff] had

17

already amended his complaint once, and since [defendant] did not consent to the filing of the

18

proposed new pleading, [plaintiff] could file a second amended complaint only by leave of court[.]").

19

Ms. Christensen's February 23, 2012, amended complaint was not made with the written consent of

20

 $ReconTrust\, or\, by\, leave\, of\, court.\,\, Accordingly, the\, February\, 23, 2012, amendment\, was\, improper\, and\, 23, 2012, amendment\, was\, improper\, and\, 24, 2012, amendment\, was\, improper\, amendment\, 24, 2012, amend$

21

must be struck from the record.

motion." LR 7-2(d).

2223

to dismiss, she has conceded that dismissal is appropriate. Indeed, this court recognizes that under

ReconTrust argues that because Ms. Christensen failed to oppose the substance of its motion

24

The Local Rules of Civil Practice for the District of Nevada, "the failure of an opposing party to file

25

points and authorities in response to any motion shall constitute a consent to the granting of the

26

27

28

1	In the absence of an amended complaint, ReconTrust's motion to dismiss is rendered
2	effectively unopposed. Accordingly, this court finds itself constrained to grant the motion and
3	dismiss the complaint.
4	Accordingly,
5	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that defendant's motion to
6	dismiss (doc. #10) be, and the same hereby is, GRANTED.
7	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the plaintiff's complaint be, and the same hereby is,
8	DISMISSED without prejudice to the filing of a new action.
9	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT defendant's motion to strike plaintiff's amended
10	complaint (doc. #21) be, and the same hereby is, GRANTED without prejudice.
11	The clerk of the court shall enter judgment for defendant accordingly.
12	DATED April 6, 2012.
13	
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
15	UNITED STATES DISTRICT SUDGE
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
an .dao	- 3 -

Case 2:12-cv-00021-JCM-GWF Document 30 Filed 04/06/12 Page 3 of 3

James C. Mahan U.S. District Judge